

more effective in this task than those of his predecessor.

An international police force remains a good idea, but something more severe is needed to make it a reality. General sanctions turn out to punish most the large and desperate Haitian underclass, which may yet be asked to carry even more of the burden if the country's oil imports are targeted; in any event, emergency food and relief, of which the United States is the chief provider, must be increased. The next appropriate turn of the screw is special sanctions aimed at the assets, including bank accounts, and visa privileges of the few who are making the many of Haiti miserable. One wonders why these things were not done before in order to make a path to democracy in a country that has seen sadly little of it.

For the OAS, Haiti has come to be a test case of its pledge to make the preservation of democracy in its member states its prime explicit mission. The failure of the OAS so far in Haiti has generated a profound crisis in the hemispheric organization. It is a crisis freshly aggravated by events in Guatemala, where a civilian president, under military pressure, yesterday suspended the constitution and dissolved the congress. The OAS foreign ministers are to meet June 6 in Managua in what is shaping up as pivotal moment for democracy in the post-Cold War Americas.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAHAM, Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S RECONCILIATION PROPOSAL

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, this morning at 11:37, we are within a very brief period of time since passage by the House of Representatives, by a very narrow vote, of the President's reconciliation proposal, which encompasses some very major changes in the projected economic future of this country.

It had been my hope at this time to have been in Philadelphia, to have been with President Clinton and other Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, and perhaps the New Jersey and Delaware delegations, scheduled to meet with President Clinton at 11:30 this morning in anticipation of a program in the Philadelphia City Hall courtyard, where the President is going to address the Nation and the world at 12 o'clock.

It is with regret that I could not be there. But I thought it more important to be on the floor to participate in the debate on the campaign finance reform.

I do not want to take a moment or two now to make some comments about the action of the House of Representatives last night, and the future of that important legislation as it will

be coming to the Senate when we return after the Memorial Day recess.

The feelings and concerns of the American people is always critical. The Members of both the House and the Senate will be talking to our constituents in substantial measure during the intervening recess.

My sense at the moment, Madam President—both in terms of what I have heard in my travels to my State and in other parts of this country, and from the very large volume of mail coming into my office—is that the people of Pennsylvania and the people of America are opposed to what the President has suggested and what the House has passed.

I believe the cornerstone of the problem is the failure of President Clinton's budget to have sufficient cuts in Federal spending. You hear a great many figures as to what the proportion of cuts is to tax increases. Some range as high as 5 to 1. The Congressional Budget Office suggests that it is about \$2.74 of new taxes to \$1.72 in cuts.

But I believe that it is plain that there are insufficient cuts in what President Clinton has proposed to be real and satisfactory to the American people. I urge the President and his assistants to take a hard look at that factor before the issue comes to the Senate and before many of us are asked to support that budget. There simply are not enough cuts.

Speaking for myself—and I know for many, many others on the other side of the aisle among the Democrats; as well as, I think, uniform Republican response—there are insufficient cuts in President Clinton's package to pass this body.

The second factor of overwhelming importance is the high incidence of taxation. President Clinton's bill has been labeled as the heaviest tax increase in the history of this country. Considering the tax increases in the history of this country, that is a significant statement. I believe those taxes have to be reanalyzed, reevaluated, and reduced.

The energy tax, simply stated, is unacceptable. It is unacceptable to have an energy tax which is regressive and that hits the poor people of America. There is an income tax credit which is supposed to offset that energy tax, but I have read the fine print, and I think it is unrealistic to expect that to happen.

The increased taxes on Social Security recipients are too high. There is a change in the taxable income on Social Security recipients going down to \$32,000 for a married couple and \$25,000 for an individual. Whatever one may say about the willingness to tax the wealthy, someone is not wealthy if they are a married couple and earn \$32,000 a year, or a single individual earning \$25,000 a year.

I make this statement, Madam President, the morning after, when there is considerable jubilation at the White House. And I accord the President his

day of jubilation, but we are going to be looking at some very, very tough issues when we come back after the Memorial Day recess.

I have said publicly and privately and on the floor of the Senate that I want to support the President where I can. He is the new President, and we want to give him a chance. But that is not a blank check. One of the every fundamental principles of our constitutional Government is separation of powers; that is, Senators are independently elected, and we are supposed to exercise our best judgment.

The second fundamental principle is checks and balances on what it is the Executive wants to do. I have read very closely the morning news reports and have seen the television stories, and there is no doubt that there is tremendous disquiet in the House of Representatives among many of those who voted in favor of the President's bill, which passed by a scant six vote margin.

It simply is not going to pass in this body in its current form, in this Senator's opinion. I make this statement now before we begin the Memorial Day recess because there is not going to be a whole lot of time when we get back. The Finance Committee will take up the issue, and there may well be a deadlock in the Finance Committee, and other Senators have spoken out.

I made an extensive floor statement on Monday of this week complimenting those who have advanced new ideas. When you lift your head above the trenches in this body and in this town, watch out. You have to be as quick to avoid being shot. I think that is the right approach, and there is ample notice for the President and his assistants to take heed and provide fundamental changes in this very, very important measure.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I do not know how long we are going to be in session yet today. I am advised that the distinguished majority leader is scheduled to come to the floor for wrap-up at 12 noon. We may be in session longer; I am not sure.

I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD a floor statement and a proposed bill for an extension of time on certain compliance requirements in western Pennsylvania. It is not quite finished. In the event I do not have it ready for presentation, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert it into the RECORD at a later point today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBB. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBB. Madam President, might I inquire if the Senate is currently conducting morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. ROBB. Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. ROBB and Mr. BOREN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1068, are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

Mr. COATS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HOMOSEXUALS IN THE MILITARY

Mr. COATS. Madam President, yesterday the President made the following statement about a proposal on homosexuals in the military: "I think we are very close to a compromise."

The President indicated that he had been in consultation with congressional leaders.

I am puzzled as to who is involved in that consultation. I can indicate that none of us on the Republican side have been engaged in any discussion with the President on the so-called compromise that he has proposed.

And yesterday, on the floor, Senator NUNN, who I think is the undisputed congressional leader when it comes to not only this issue, but all issues of military importance, indicated:

I have not had any discussions with administration officials on the outlines of any proposal on this issue that they may be working on.

So I really do not know who the President has been referring to when he said he has been in discussion with congressional officials.

I also find it almost impossible to ascertain where the President is on this issue. For months, he has made unequivocal statements indicating that he wants to lift the ban completely, that he thinks the former policy is not the policy that he would endorse, that he would be issuing an Executive order to lift that ban. He has repeated on numerous occasions his support for the complete lifting of the ban as advo-

cated by those in the homosexual community and those certainly in support of that position.

Lately, there has been some equivocation on his part in terms of whether this will be the right political solution to the problem. Apparently, in reading the polls and the mail, the President has decided that that former position might not be one that he wants to embrace from a political standpoint.

This latest declaration has produced all kinds of conflicting statements coming from those who both support lifting of the ban and those on who oppose lifting of the ban.

I have read now four different interpretations of the members of the homosexual community and those who advocate lifting the ban as to what the President means by saying he is close to a compromise; four different interpretations.

There is great confusion on the side of those of us who do not advocate lifting the ban, for reasons we have stated and will continue to state as to what the interpretation is of the President's so-called compromise.

So I call upon the President, if he is close to a compromise, to tell us exactly what that compromise is and exactly who is he consulting with on the congressional side, because I think there are a number of Members here who have a very important stake in the outcome of that issue that obviously have indicated they have not been consulted.

Now, many claim that the President's compromise is one which would regulate conduct while on duty on base, but allow the private conduct off duty off base to be exempted from any possible military oversight.

Well, I think this shows a real lack of understanding of military life.

As the military has so often indicated, there really is no such thing as off duty for many of our people in uniform. What does it mean to be off duty in Somalia? What does it mean to be off duty in the Persian Gulf? What does it mean to be off duty on an aircraft carrier deployed at sea or a submarine under the polar ice?

Really, what does it mean to be off duty, even though you do your 8-to-6 job on base, or for the person who simply lives on the base and across the street, or perhaps crosses the street outside the base and lives in an apartment across the street?

Senator NUNN pointed out yesterday the participants of Tailhook were off duty. They were out of uniform. It was a weekend. It supposedly was a purely private matter.

Is the President going to endorse a proposal which would allow the kind of conduct that took place at the Tailhook convention to be exempted from any military regulation? I do not think that is what he intends. Yet his so-called compromise proposal indicates that that is what he would like.

There is a serious proposal on the table. That proposal has little to do

with the President's plan or the President's comments. And that proposal is Senator NUNN's proposal. Many in Congress are rushing to embrace it.

I have, however, some very serious questions that I think need to be answered to our satisfaction before we can say that is the so-called solution to this problem.

I am a hard-sell on the issue, because there is a great deal at stake. What is at stake is the most efficient, effective military the world has ever seen; that is a deterrent to aggression, a deterrent to war and brutality in many places of the world; that has protected our freedom for more than 200 years, and I think an institution which many of us takes a great deal of pride in, which Americans take a great deal of pride in.

It is more efficient now than it has ever been, more effective now than it has ever been, because of many of the policies that have been adopted and followed by the military and endorsed by this Congress.

So I am very reluctant to change it, particularly when those in the military—not just the Joint Chiefs of Staff, not just Colin Powell and Norm Schwarzkopf—but all the people all the way down through the ranks. Many on down the ranks—sergeants, corporals, privates, enlisted men, officers, and others—tell us that a change in this policy will seriously undermine the effectiveness, the normal discipline, the good order, as Colin Powell has indicated, that it is so important to the effectiveness of the military.

These are the questions, however, I think that need some answers before we can rush to embrace a "don't ask, don't tell" compromise, which has been offered, which is a serious proposal and merits a serious discussion.

Question 1: What exactly does "don't ask" mean? We know it is meant to imply at induction or recruitment time, but what about later? Can a commander, with adequate reasons to do so, ask the question? If the answer is yes, then what is that commander's response to be? How will this affect investigations? How will this affect the potential discharge proceedings? How will this affect the morale of the unit, and the military unit cohesiveness and effectiveness that so many have told us is important?

Question 2: What exactly does "don't tell" mean? What about actions off base? For many soldiers, off base and private time have no meaning. If a unit knows a soldier is a homosexual, even if he or she does not advertise it, all the problems we have identified in the six hearings we have had will still exist.

Question 3: What will be the discharge procedure? Will the military retain its right to discharge homosexuals because their presence is incompatible with military service? What about those who have been previously discharged or those who are in the pipe-